

grounds upon which it can be evaluated whether in fact the required distinctness and reasons for insisting on election are established. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the PTO has not carried its burden of proof to establish distinctness.

Furthermore, MPEP §803 states the following:

If the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions.

Claims 1-17 are all directed to multi-layer printed wiring boards, and the Office Action acknowledges Claim 1 as generic. Thus, it appears that the claims in the present application are part of an overlapping search area and that a search for Claims 1-6 and 8-17 would necessarily include a search directed to the rest of the claims as well. It is therefore believed that there is no undue burden on the Examiner to search all the claims under MPEP § 803, and Applicant respectfully traverses the Election of Species Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single disclosed species be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of each of Claims 1-17 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)



Akimiro Yamazaki  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 46,155

AY/mda

I:\ATTY\AKY\27s\278942\278942US\_ELE.DOC